Ingres' *Raphael and La Fornarina*: The Marriage of Classicism and Romanticism

Research Thesis

Presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for graduation
with research distinction in History of Art in the undergraduate
colleges of The Ohio State University

by

Benjamin Shehadi

The Ohio State University
April 2021

Project Advisor: Professor Andrew Shelton, Department of History of Art

The romance between Raphael and the Fornarina is, in the words of humanities scholar Marie Lathers, "the archetypal artist-model relationship of Western tradition."[1] Nowhere is this classic story more tenderly and iconically depicted than in Jean-Auguste-Dominique Ingres' *Raphael and La Fornarina* series. Ingres' masterful paintings perfectly harmonized elements from the competing Neoclassical and Romantic art traditions in the early and mid 19th century. In these works, Ingres imbued the Classical heritage, as exemplified by Raphael's art, with a new sense of Romantic emotionalism and individuality. In this way, Ingres forged a distinctive style of Romantic Classicism, which solidified his status among the pantheon of great Western painters.

Raphael, The Lover

Vasari's *Lives* speaks of Raphael's infatuation with his mistress:

"Raffaello was a very amorous person, delighting much in women, and ever ready to serve them; which was the reason that, in the pursuit of his carnal pleasures, he found his friends more complacent and indulgent towards him than perchance was right. Wherefore, when his dear friend Agostino Chigi commissioned him to paint the first loggia in his palace, Raffaello was not able to give much attention to his work, on account of the love that he had for his mistress."[2]

According to Vasari's account, Raphael was distracted by the love of his mistress during his work on Agostino Chigi's villa. Chigi became frustrated with Raphael, and eventually arranged

[1] Lathers p.61
[2] Vasari p.239

for the woman to sit next to the artist while he painted.[3] In the early 17th century, Raphael's mistress was identified with the Palazzo Barberini portrait **(Figure 1)**, which came to be called *La Fornarina* in the 18th century.[4] The nickname *La Fornarina* means "the baker's daughter" in Italian.[5] Engravings of the Barberini portrait, such as those in Domenico Cunego's book *Schola Italica Picturae* (1773), established it as one of the Renaissance master's most recognized works in the 18th century.[6] Richard Duppa's *Life of Raffaello Sanzio Da Urbino* (1816) describes Raphael's relationship with the Fornarina:

"Raffaello was not married, but he constantly lived with a beautiful woman; known by the distinction of *La bella Fornarina*. This person early engaged his affections, and he was devotedly attached to her: he lived with her till his death, and left her a considerable part of his property. In his will, after having made her a sufficient provision to live independent, he bequeathed the residue to [his disciples] …"[7]

The *La Fornarina* portrait was traditionally attributed to Raphael's student, Giulio Romano, despite the fact that the woman's armband clearly has Raphael's name inscribed on it.[8] This traditional attribution was challenged only after the cleaning of the portrait in 1820. Quatremère de Quincy suggested that *La Fornarina* was Romano's copy of an original Raphael painting, but other early 19th-century scholars believed that Raphael's *La Donna Velata* **(Figure 2)** was the portrait of his true mistress.[9] By the time Quatremère wrote his biography of Raphael, it was generally accepted that Raphael's mistress was his model, a woman named Margarita

[3] Greenberg, p.16-17
[4] Lathers p.68
[5] Epstein p.60
[6] Greenberg, p.17
[7] Duppa, p.74-75
[8] Lathers p.69
[9] Lathers p.68

(based on the notations in the margins of a 16th-century copy of Vasari's *Lives*).[10] In the late 19th century, Antonio Valeri identified this 'Margarita' as Margarita Luti, the daughter of a baker from Siena.[11] Valeri claimed that the Fornarina entered a convent for sexually promiscuous women in Rome four months after Raphael's death.[12] There is no historical evidence, however, that Luti (who entered the convent of Sant'Apollonia immediately after Raphael's death) was the same person as Raphael's mistress.[13] Giovanni Morelli, a 19th-century Italian art historian, attributed the *La Fornarina* portrait to Giulio Romano, the author of the salacious *I Modi* series, in order to protect Raphael's reputation from charges of fornication and to shift the blame to the Fornarina.[14] Not all biographers in the 19th century agreed about the identity of the Fornarina. Alfred Baron von Wolzogen's *Raphael Santi: His Life and His Works* (1866)[15] states that it is unclear whether Raphael's mistress was the same person as the Fornarina:

"But whether the 'una sua Donna'—who, according to Vasari, at one time so completely drew away the master [Raphael] from his work, that his friend Chigi at length could devise no other means than to bring the beautiful woman to him on his painter's scaffold, where she sat the whole day by his side, and he could carry on his work without being deprived of her company—whether this charmer was identical with the so called Fornarina…is not at all certain."[16]

The Fornarina's role in Raphael's life was interesting to 19th-century artists and biographers of Raphael for two reasons. First, Romantic painters were interested in the scene of

[10] Lather p.68; Espinel p.1
[11] Lathers 68 (See also Brown and Oberhuber 49)
[12] Lathers p.68
[13] "La Fornarina", Galleria Borghese, https://web.archive.org/web/20120519051213/http://www.galleriaborghese.it/barberini/it/fornarin.htm
[14] Lathers p.71
[15] Wolzogen's biography of Raphael was written after Ingres made his *Raphael and La Fornarina* paintings, the last of which Ingres began making in 1860.
[16] Wolzogen p.95-96

Raphael's death, which Vasari had attributed to Raphael's promiscuity with a woman they identified as the Fornarina. Second, some 19th-century biographers blamed the Fornarina for the naturalism of Raphael's later works.[17] In the first edition of his biography (1814), Quatremère did not dispute Vasari's version of Raphael's death. In the 1835 edition, however, he attributed Raphael's death to an illness, rather than sexual activity, in order to present Raphael as a hard-working religious artist untainted by the world.[18] This biographical tactic was used to denigrate the Fornarina and the modelling profession more generally as merely working-class.[19]

Ingres' *Raphael* Series

Ingres moved to Rome in 1806 after winning the Prix de Rome. In 1812, the artist planned a series depicting Raphael's life based on the biographies by Vasari (1550) and Angelo Comolli (1790).[20] Of the proposed series, Ingres only painted *The Betrothal of Raphael to Cardinal Bibbiena's Niece* **(Figure 3)** and *Raphael and La Fornarina*[21] **(Figure 25)**, both of which featured amorous anecdotes that mirrored his own life.[22] Ingres married Madeleine Chapelle on 4 Dec 1813.[23] According to the Metropolitan Museum, he used his wife as his model for his 1814 sketch of the Fornarina **(Figure 4)**.[24] Many of Ingres' contemporaries in Rome created projects depicting Raphael's life. Around 1819, Austrian painter Johann Scheffer von Leonardschoff (1795-1822) painted three scenes from Raphael's life: his training under

[17] Lathers p.71
[18] Lathers p.69-70
[19] Lathers p.71
[20] McVaugh p.379; Cohn & Siegfried p.54
[21] The earliest version of Ingres' *Raphael and La Fornarina* was made around the same time as *The Betrothal of Raphael to Cardinal Bibbiena's Niece*.
[22] Cohn & Siegfried p.54
[23] Rosenblum p.98; Epstein p.63
[24] Ingres, "Study for Raphael and the Fornarina" (c.1814?). Metropolitan Museum of Art, https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/459965

Perugino, his introduction to Julius II by Bramante, and his death. Scheffer also painted *Raphael and La Fornarina* **(Figure 5)**. Scheffer presented Raphael as a model for young artists. According to art historian Robert E. McVaugh, Scheffer's paintings were intended to show that "hard work under enlightened guidance and the respectful cultivation of powerful patrons could lead to temporal honors and eternal fame."[25] Ingres' *Raphael and La Fornarina* series likely had the same goal.

Ingres' Models for La Fornarina

Ingres' depiction of the Fornarina was modelled on the portrait of her attributed to Raphael **(Figure 1)** and on the figure of the Virgin in the *Madonna of the Chair* **(Figure 6)**, for which Raphael supposedly used the Fornarina as a model.[26] Ingres based the Fornarina's pose and gaze on Raphael's *Madonna of the Chair*.[27] When Ingres was a 12-year old student in Toulouse, he first saw a copy of the *Madonna of the Chair* made by his teacher Joseph Roques.[28] Ingres later described this experience as seeing "a star that had fallen out of heaven."[29] According to art history professor Eldon van Liere, Ingres' inclusion of the *Madonna of the Chair* in the *Raphael and La Fornarina* paintings reveals that the artist's religiosity was dominated by women.[30] Scholars David Alan Brown and Jan Van Nimmen described Ingres' depiction of the Fornarina in an 1814 study for *Raphael and La Fornarina* **(Figure 4)** as "Bindo reincarnated as a woman."[31] Similar to Bindo Altoviti in Raphael's portrait **(Figure 12)**, the Fornarina in Ingres' sketch has wide-set almond-shaped eyes, a long nose, and thick lips.

[25] McVaugh p.382
[26] Van Liere p.108; Epstein p.60; Cohn & Siegfried p.54
[27] Cohn & Siegfried p.54
[28] Epstein, p.58
[29] Ingres, as quoted in Epstein p.58
[30] Van Liere p.108
[31] Brown & Nimmen p.101

Raphael's Appearance

In his biography of Raphael, Quatremère offers the following physical description of Raphael:

"The person and face of Raphael has been well preserved in several portraits by himself, and by the descriptions of his contemporaries. He was of small stature, and delicately formed; his face was handsome, and expressive of great modesty and sweetness of disposition; his hair and eyes were brown, and his complexion bordering upon olive; his neck was very long, and (alas! again, for the phrenologists) his head was small. His manners are described as graceful and elegant; and he seems to have gained golden opinions of all sorts of people. He was indeed a most remarkable and most fortunate man; perhaps not less fortunate in his early death than in his glorious life."[32]

Quatremère's description corresponds well to Ingres' depiction of the Renaissance master in the *Raphael and La Fornarina* series. Throughout the series, Ingres consistently depicted Raphael with long hair, a slender neck, olive-colored skin, and a fairly small head. Ingres' rendering of Raphael's facial features and black hat[33] is comparable to what we see in Raphael's self-portrait in the Uffizi **(Figure 7)** and in Raphael's now-lost *Portrait of a Young Man* (c.1514), formerly held at the Czartoryski Museum **(Figure 8)**. Ingres based his depiction of Raphael on an engraving of the *Portrait of a Young Man*, which he thought was a self-portrait by Raphael **(Figure 9)**. In the Fogg version of *Raphael and La Fornarina* **(Figure 26)**, Ingres depicted Raphael with an anachronistic cape similar to that shown in Ingres' *Portrait of Lorenzo Bartolini* **(Figure 10)** and with a costume similar to Poussin's *Self-Portrait with Muse* (now in the Louvre)

[32] Quatremère de Quincy, p.104
[33] The black hat appears only in the Riga and Fogg versions, both of which were made before the Salon of 1814.

(Figure 11).[34] According to Brown and Nimmen, Ingres based his depiction of Raphael in the *Betrothal of Raphael* **(Figure 3)** on Raphael's *Portrait of Bindo Altoviti* **(Figure 12)**, which he also erroneously believed was a self-portrait of Raphael, and the *Violinist* (1518) by Sebastiano del Piombo **(Figure 13)**.[35]

Raphael's Reputation in the early and mid 19th century

Literary interest in Raphael, which was already strong in the 18th century, blossomed during the Neoclassical and Romantic periods.[36] Comolli and other early 19th-century biographers of Raphael, such as Richard Duppa (1816) and Quatremère de Quincy (1814), rehashed the anecdotes found in Vasari's *Lives*. Despite their lack of originality, these biographies enjoyed widespread popularity with Ingres and other academic painters.[37] According to art historian Sarah Betzer, Ingres' *Raphael and La Fornarina* was part of a trend among 19th-century painters, who depicted scenes from the lives of famous artists.[38] After 1800, such anecdotes became standard themes in history painting.[39] According to Betzer, Salon rosters indicate that Raphael was the most frequently depicted painter in the early 19th century.[40]

The French Revolution and Napoleonic campaigns sparked interest in Raphael's art. According to art history professor Martin Rosenberg, French academic painters of the 19th century revered Raphael as the "Renaissance embodiment of classical perfection."[41] Rosenberg argues that Napoleon employed Raphael's art as "propaganda in legitimizing his hegemony over

[34] Cohn & Siegfried p.56
[35] Brown & Nimmen p.98
[36] McVaugh, p.379
[37] McVaugh, p.379
[38] Betzer p.7
[39] Cohn & Siegfried p.54
[40] Betzer p.7
[41] Rosenberg's "Raphael's *Transfiguration* and Napoleon's Cultural Politics", p.186

Europe."[42] During his Italian campaign, Napoleon seized 23 of Raphael's works including the *Transfiguration*, *La Belle Jardinière*, and the *Madonna della sedia*.[43] Two of those three paintings appear in Ingres' *Raphael and La Fornarina* series. The *Transfiguration* in particular may have had royalist or nationalist implications for Ingres. Napoleon's seizure of that work was seen as a national reclamation, because the painting had originally been commissioned for the French cathedral of Narbonne by the Cardinal de Medici.[44] The confiscated objects from Napoleon's Italian campaign, including Raphael's paintings, were given a triumphal entry on 27 July 1798, the 4th anniversary of Robespierre's fall.[45] These paintings by Raphael were prominently displayed in France's national museum, the Musée Napoléon, the precursor to the modern Louvre Museum.

The theme of Raphael's death made its first appearance in French academic art with Fulchran-Jean Harriet's *dessin allegorique*, which was displayed at the Salon of 1800 **(Figure 14)**. Nicolas-André Monsiau's drawing of Raphael's death **(Figure 15)** was exhibited at the Salon of 1804.[46] Pierre-Nolasque Bergeret's painting of the *Honors Paid to Raphael at his Death* (1806) **(Figure 16)** was highly praised by Salon critics two years later and was bought by Napoleon himself.[47] Vasari states that Raphael died before finishing the *Transfiguration*, which was present at his death bed.[48] Monsiau's and Bergeret's depictions of Raphael's death include the *Transfiguration* in the background. Bergeret's painting also includes the *Madonna of the Chair* in the distant background.

---

[42] Rosenberg's "Raphael's *Transfiguration* and Napoleon's Cultural Politics", p.188
[43] Betzer, p.9
[44] Rosenberg, "Raphael's *Transfiguration* and Napoleon's Cultural Politic", p.191
[45] Rosenberg, "Raphael's *Transfiguration* and Napoleon's Cultural Politic", p.191
[46] Rosenberg, "Raphael's *Transfiguration* and Napoleon's Cultural Politics", p.200
[47] Rosenberg's "Raphael's *Transfiguration* and Napoleon's Cultural Politics," p.200
[48] Vasari, p.248

French academic painters of the early 19th century emphasized the way that papal patronage cultivated the Renaissance master's skill.[49] Artistic talent was not seen as the product of individual genius, but of wealthy patronage. Academic depictions of Raphael's death reinforced this view by showing the artist's patrons by his bed. In Bergeret's rendition of the theme, Pope Leo X himself is seen paying homage to the dead artist. Bergeret also included the *Transfiguration*, which was commissioned by Cardinal Giulio de' Medici (the future Pope Clement VII).[50] Academic paintings of Raphael by Bergeret and others implied that Napoleon was a great patron who, like Pope Julius II or Pope Leo X in Raphael's lifetime, would usher in a new artistic golden age.[51] Ingres' *Raphael and La Fornarina* series reflects how the artist sought for himself the kind of patronage enjoyed by the Renaissance masters.[52] Ingres' idealization of artistic patronage is even more clearly seen in his *Death of Leonardo Da Vinci* **(Figure 17)**, in which King Francis I embraces the dying Renaissance artist.

In 1833, Raphael's tomb in the Roman Pantheon was opened in order to resolve the dispute over whether the skull in the Academy of St. Luke belonged to the Renaissance master or to Desiderio de Adintorio, the founder of the Pantheon's Society of Virtuosi who died in 1542 (22 years after Raphael).[53] Based on Vasari's description and on the artist's self-portrait in the *School of Athens*, Antonio Nibby (a Beaux-Arts official in Rome) determined that the skeleton in the Pantheon, including its skull, belonged to Raphael.[54] That year, Johann Riepenhausen (1789-1860) published 12 engravings for Comolli's *Vita di Raffaelle da Urbino*. One of these engravings **(Figure 18)** depicts the exact same episode as Ingres' series: *Raphael and La*

[49] Rosenberg's "Raphael's *Transfiguration* and Napoleon's Cultural Politics," p.200
[50] Vasari, p.248
[51] Rosenberg's "Raphael's *Transfiguration* and Napoleon's Cultural Politics," p.203
[52] Cohn & Siegfried p.54 (Lapauze, 1901, p.207, 211-223)
[53] Lathers p.64
[54] Lathers, p.66

Fornarina.[55] It is unclear whether Ingres knew about Riepenhausen's project.[56] In the appendix to the third edition of his biography of Raphael, Quatremère included passages of Nibby's letter regarding Raphael's burial.[57]

Admiration of Raphael was not restricted to France. In 1824, Henri Jean-Baptiste Fradelle (1778-1865) showed his painting of *Raphael and La Fornarina* **(Figure 19)** at the British Institution; he showed a second larger interpretation of the subject 21 years later.[58] William Brockedon (1787-1854) exhibited *La Bella Fornarina observing the progress of her portrait in Raphael's study* at the British Institution in 1824.[59] Augustus Wall Callcott (1779-1844) painted *Raphael and the Fornarina* **(Figure 20)** for the Royal Academy Exhibition of 1837.[60] To say the least, Raphael was extremely popular among 19th-century European artists, who saw Raphael's art as an "aesthetic and sexual synthesis," according to McVaugh.[61]

In the early and mid 19th century, there was also a counter-Raphael movement in France. In the early 1800s, the Barbus painters promoted a medieval and Quattrocento style.[62] Ingres' more Romantically-minded contemporaries eschewed Davidian Classicism in favor of more 'primitive' art sources like Etruscan vases, Early Christian mosaics, and the Pre-Raphaelite styles of Masaccio and Giotto.[63] Members of the Ultramontane movement of the French Neo-Catholic Revival, a reactionary religious movement of the 1830s that supported the papacy's political power, derided Raphael's *Transfiguration* as the embodiment of his degenerate late style.[64] In *Du*

---

[55] McVaugh p.382
[56] Wolohojian p.157
[57] Lathers p.64
[58] McVaugh p.382
[59] McVaugh p.383. An 1826 copy of Brockedon's painting by Charles Turner is held at the Royal Collection Trust (RCIN 813619).
[60] McVaugh p.383. Lumb Stocks' print (1843), made after Colcott's painting, is held at the British Museum (1845,1011.1).
[61] McVaugh p.383
[62] Lathers, p.64
[63] Rosenberg, *Raphael and France*, p.169
[64] Rosenberg, *Raphael and France*, p.175

Vandalisme et du Catholicism dans l'art (1839), the historian and publicist Charles de Montalembert argued that Raphael's early work represented the height of Christian art but that the Renaissance master subsequently indulged in a decadent naturalist style. Montalembert and other critics viewed Raphael's *La Fornarina* portrait as the epitome of the painter's naturalistic style. They also attributed the secularity of Raphael's later style to the influence of his mistress.[65] Ingres clearly disagreed with this negative assessment of Raphael's late manner. He chose to depict Raphael's mistress in the studio—with the *Transfiguration* in the background in some versions—as a tribute to the so-called 'decadent' style of the Renaissance master's mature works. As will be discussed below, Ingres' *Raphael and La Fornarina* series visually demonstrates the positive, generative relationship he believed existed between Raphael's naturalistic art and his erotic passion.

Genre historique

Ingres' *Raphael and La Fornarina* series exemplifies the *genre historique* or historical genre mode of painting.[66] The artist became a specialist in *genre historique* paintings during his time in Rome.[67] This type of painting depicted historical subjects from the Middle Ages and Renaissance, as opposed to Classical or Biblical subjects. As its name would suggest, *genre historique* focused on intimate scenes from the private lives of famous individuals rather than grand historical events. Stylistically, *genre historique* paintings included highly refined, detailed depictions of costume and setting. *Genre historique* was first made popular in France under

[65] Lathers p.64
[66] For more information on *genre historique*, see Shelton's *Ingres* (p.63, 66) and Haskell (p.58)
[67] Shelton, *Ingres*, p.63

Napoleon; Empress Josephine strongly supported this style.[68] In the early 19th century, French academic painters depicted historical genre scenes from the lives of national heroes such as Pierre Terrail, seigneur de Bayard (a military general) and the military commander Bernard Du Guesclin. After the exhibition of Bergeret's *Honors Paid to Raphael at his Death* **(Figure 16)**, every Salon had at least one *genre historique* painting of an artist's life until 1886.[69] Between 1804-1807, there were on average two such paintings in each Salon. After the Bourbon Restoration, the number of *genre historique* paintings increased significantly, perhaps to glorify the new monarchs as cultured patrons of the arts. In the 1820s, there were as many as 10 such paintings in each Salon.[70] *Genre historique* was popular during the Restoration because it evoked a royalist nostalgia for the pre-Revolutionary period.[71]

Ingres' *Raphael and La Fornarina* paintings, particularly the one in the Fogg Museum **(Figure 26)**, bears some stylistic similarities to his *Paolo and Francesca* paintings, particularly the one in the Musée Condé **(Figure 21)**. Both themes involve an intimate male-female encounter. One of Ingres' contemporaries at the 1855 Universal Exposition commented on *Paolo and Francesca*, "Paolo is not a man; he is a kiss."[72] To a lesser degree, the same may be said of Raphael in Ingres' chivalric portrayal of the artist in the *Raphael and La Fornarina* series. Both of Ingres' series are rendered with a smooth finish and vibrant colors.[73] Both couples are presented in elaborate costumes. The sentimentality of the *Raphael and La Fornarina* series and the *Paolo and Francesca* paintings could be considered feminine, in contrast with masculine Enlightenment classicism. Overt civic moralism, often seen in David's works such as the *Oath of*

---

[68] Shelton, *Ingres*, p.63
[69] Haskell, p.58
[70] Haskell p.55, 58
[71] Shelton, *Ingres*, p.63
[72] An unnamed contemporary of Ingres at the 1855 Universal Exposition, as quoted in Krauss, p.153
[73] The Louvre identifies smooth brushwork and vibrant color as characteristics of the troubadour style. "Rome and Florence (1806-1824): Paintings in the New 'Troubadour' Style." The Louvre. http://mini-site.louvre.fr/ingres/1.4.2.4_en.html.

the Horatii **(Figure 22)**, is notably absent in Ingres' depictions of *Raphael and La Fornarina* and *Paolo and Francesca*. Unlike David's *Oath*, Ingres' depictions of the Renaissance master and the passionate Paolo do not inspire social reform. Instead, these paintings merely titillate the viewer through their amorous subject matter and technical virtuosity. The *Oath* demands active civic participation, which is associated with masculinity. The *Raphael and La Fornarina* and *Paolo and Francesca* paintings depict intimate anecdotes in private settings, which is associated with femininity.[74]

Neoclassicism vs. Romanticism

The aesthetic status quo in France at the turn of the 19th century was the Classicism of Jacques-Louis David. Later on, however, the French Academy became divided between artists who defended the Davidian status quo and those who sought more individuality and originality in art. The latter group of French academic painters, joined by outsiders who would eventually be known as Romantics, sought ideals more relevant to the present than the past.[75] According to Arnold Hauser's *Social History of Art*, the post-Napoleonic era of constitutional monarchy (1814-1848) saw the erosion of the traditional authority of both the French Academy and monarchy. Hauser states that artistic orthodoxy no longer existed; equally powerful schools competed for public attention.[76] In the 1820s, the Salons (particularly those of 1824 and 1827) helped define the new aesthetics of French Romanticism, which eschewed the French Classicist tradition in favor of more contemporary themes and less classical aesthetics.[77] Although it

[74] Shelton, Review of *Staging Empire*, p.148
[75] Rosenberg, *Raphael and France*, p.166
[76] Arnold Hauser's *Social History of Art*, as cited by Shelton, "Ingres vs. Delacroix," p.735-736
[77] Rosenberg, *Raphael and France*, p.165

deviated from Davidian Classicism, Ingres' art throughout the 1820s and early 1830s was still quite traditional.[78] Romanticism and Classicism existed on a spectrum. On the Neoclassical end, the conservative critic Étienne-Jean Delécluze of the *Journal des Débats* defended Davidian Classicism. According to Rosenberg, Delécluze "praised the art of David, Ingres, and Raphael as Homeric, [which he] contrasted with that of Horace Vernet, whom he disparaged as Shakespearan."[79] To Délecluze, Ingres' *Vow of Louis XIII* (1824) **(Figure 23)** established the artist as the new Raphael. On the Romantic end of the spectrum, Rosenberg explains, the critic Stendhal

"believed that France had to rid itself of the albatross of classical tradition. He even accused David of only being capable of painting bodies, not souls. Abandoning the concept of a timeless ideal—which is the basis of classicism—Stendhal believed that ideas of beauty must respond to historical change…This more relativistic view of history corresponded to the rise of historicism in the visual arts, a movement in which Ingres and Delacroix took active parts."[80]

Inspired by Johann Joachim Winckelmann's ideas about the influence of culture on art, Stendhal, Rosenberg explains, called for a new art with "the greater psychological complexity of a later stage of civilization" to be ushered in by a new Raphael.[81] In his *Histoire de la peinture en Italie* (1827), Stendhal argued that the Renaissance painters depicted themes which were relevant for their time, and suggested that French artists do the same.[82] Stendhal had a Romantic view of the Renaissance, which he regarded as more passionate and freer than his own era. Stendhal

[78] Shelton, "Ingres vs. Delacroix", p.729
[79] Rosenberg, *Raphael and France*, p.166
[80] Rosenberg, *Raphael and France*, p.166
[81] Rosenberg, *Raphael and France*, p.167
[82] Rosenberg, *Raphael and France*, p.166

attributed Raphael's success to the Renaissance master's love affairs: "Great men always associated the woman they loved with the success of their art. A few people will understand Raphael's happiness, as he painted the sublime St. Cecilia from *La Fornarina*."[83] Like the 18th-century encyclopédist and art critic Denis Diderot, Stendhal believed that good art had to express the artist's unique vision.

Ingres' *Raphael and La Fornarina* series represents the perfect marriage of these two ends of the aesthetic spectrum. Ingres was able to accomplish this feat because, despite their apparent incompatibility, Neoclassicism and Romanticism were both rooted in a traditionalist outlook. As Rosenberg explains, the Neoclassical style was itself Romantic because both movements were "based on a desire to recapture the glory of a lost age."[84] That 'lost age' was the Middle Ages to the Romantics, and Classical Antiquity to the Davidians. Ingres' choice of subject matter reflects this fundamental unity between Neoclassicism and Romanticism. His sentimental depictions of *Raphael and La Fornarina* expressed a romanticized view of Raphael and the Renaissance, akin to Stendhal's vision. The fluidity of style between Neoclassicism and Romanticism in Ingres' *Raphael and La Fornarina* series was made possible by this liberalization of aesthetic norms.

Ingres' Defense of Raphael

Art historian Andrew Shelton provides one of the most interesting analyses of Ingres' adoration of Raphael. To Ingres, Shelton argues, Raphael was a "personal hero or guardian angel, a kind of art-historical oracle whose messages [Ingres] alone knows how to interpret and put to

[83] Stendhal (quoted in Wakefield, *Stendhal and the Arts*, 44), as quoted in Rosenberg, *Raphael and France*, p.167
[84] Rosenberg, *Raphael and France*, p.165

good use."[85] Shelton argues that Ingres "personalized" Raphael as a response to the Romantic (and modernist) demand for individuality and originality in art.[86] Against many of his contemporaries, Ingres boldly asserted his admiration of the Renaissance master in his *Raphael and La Fornarina* series.

That Ingres was a staunch follower of Raphael is abundantly apparent from his correspondence and other recorded remarks. In 1814, he declared, "Raphael was not only the greatest of painters; he was beauty, he was good, he was all."[87] Eugène Emmanuel Amaury Duval, Ingres' pupil, recorded him as saying, "Raphael was not a man, but a god descended to earth."[88] Ingres' admiration of Raphael knew no bounds. He explained, "I would need a book, volumes to expound on the qualities of Raphael and on his incomparable inventions; but I will say that the frescoes in the Vatican are worth more themselves than all the galleries of paintings together…When I think that three hundred years earlier I could have become his true disciple."[89] Ingres was enamoured with Raphael's masterful naturalism. He wrote, "Raphael…had mastered nature so thoroughly, he had it so well in memory, that instead of its commanding him, one would say that she herself obeyed him, that she came spontaneously to place herself in his works. One would say that, like a passionate mistress, her beautiful eyes and all her other compelling charms existed only that she might offer them to the happy and privileged Raphael, a sort of divinity on earth."[90]

Ingres viewed Raphael as superior to Titian, because Raphael emphasized line over color. Ingres was even less fond of Rubens. He wrote, "Rubens is a great painter, but a great painter

---

[85] Shelton, *Ingres*, p.120
[86] Shelton, *Ingres*, p.120
[87] Ingres, as quoted in Betzer p.10
[88] Amaury-Duval, as quoted in Epstein p.58
[89] Ingres, as quoted in Rosenberg, *Raphael and France*, p.170
[90] Ingres, as quoted in van Liere p.114 and Siegfried p.183

who has lost everything."[91] Ingres told his pupils to avoid Rubens' paintings in museums because "if you approach them, you will surely have bad things to say about my teaching and me."[92] In the revolt against Davidian Classicism, many of Ingres' contemporaries (including his rival Delacroix) favored the sublime emotionalism of Michelangelo and Rubens over Raphael. At one point, Ingres disparaged Delacroix as the "new Rubens."[93] Delacroix, in turn, dismissed Ingres' display at the 1855 Universal Exposition (an international art exhibition in Paris) as "the complete expression of an incomplete intelligence."[94] Although he shared Ingres' admiration of Raphael, Delacroix wrote that "Raphael had no more attained perfection than has anyone else."[95] Hence, Ingres positioned himself as a defender of Raphaelesque Classicism against more orthodox Romantics such as Delacroix, who emphasized color over line in their paintings. In a letter to his friend Charles Marcotte, Ingres wrote:

"Art is sick and who will save it? Will it perish entirely? No, not if one takes another path—that of nature as viewed by the Greeks and Raphael. Our manners are degraded—they have become mannered. But it is necessary to turn to the past, to regress in order to find the good path."[96]

According to van Liere, Ingres was criticized by his contemporaries as a "close-minded pugnacious defender of conservative values."[97] At the Salon of 1824, Stendhal and other critics dismissed Ingres' *Vow of Louis XIII* **(Figure 23)** as a rehashing of Raphael's art. Ingres

[91] Ingres, as quoted in Rosenberg, *Raphael and France*, p.171
[92] Ingres, as quoted in Rosenberg, *Raphael and France*, p.171
[93] Ingres, as quoted in Rosenberg, *Raphael and France*, p.171
[94] Delacroix, as quoted in Brown, "Ingres' Pursuit of Perfection," p.179
[95] Delacroix (*Oeuvres littéraires*, 2:9), as quoted in Rosenberg, *Raphael and France*, p.179.
[96] Ingres' *Letter to Marcotte* (15 Jan 1828), as quoted in Shelton, *Ingres*, p.119
[97] Van Liere p.108

responded to the critics, "I admire the masters, I bow before them…but I do not copy them."[98] As art historian Adrian Rifkin has argued, Ingres presented himself as

"an artist working in the modern world on the ground of a displaced aesthetic through his practice. He is a conservative and a revolutionary. He kneels before his models—Homer, Phidias, Raphael—he repeats them without aping them, and he responds to the world he lives in without for one moment succumbing to the allure of either cash or fashion."[99]

Ingres' Synthesis

By looking to Raphael's art, rather than the art of Antiquity, Ingres deviated from his mentor David's style and forged his own unique brand of Raphaelesque Classicism.[100] According to Shelton, Ingres' supporters were political conservatives (monarchists and Napoleon supporters) who saw Ingres as the "heir to the great classical tradition of Phidias and Raphael."[101] The Classicism of *Raphael and La Fornarina* lies in its subject matter and its naturalistic rendering. The series is a tribute to the classical aesthetics of the Renaissance. The pictures include some of Raphael's most revered paintings, such as the *Madonna della Sedia* and *Transfiguration*, in their backgrounds. The floor of Raphael's studio in the Fogg version **(Figure 26)** is decorated with ornate geometric designs. It is a virtuosic display of linear perspective that harkens back to the age of Brunelleschi and Alberti. The virtuosity of Ingres' floor in the Fogg version **(Figure 26)** resembles that found in the *sacra conversazione* paintings of the

[98] Ingres, as quoted in Rosenberg, *Raphael and France*, p.171
[99] Rifkin p.10
[100] Rosenberg's "Raphael's *Transfiguration* and Napoleon's Cultural Politics", p.188
[101] Shelton, *Ingres*, p.198, writing specifically of the critical reaction to Ingres' display in the 1855 Universal Exposition

Quattrocento, such as the *Madonna di Piazza* (c.1475-83) by Verrocchio and Lorenzo di Credi **(Figure 24)**. In the top left corner of the Fogg version **(Figure 26)**, one sees the Renaissance architecture of Rome outside of Raphael's window. This architecture consists of Roman arches, Doric columns, and rows of equidistant square windows. Art historian Robert Rosenblum identified the background in the Fogg version as the Vatican and Old St. Peter's Church before the time of Michelangelo.[102] The elegant wooden walls of Raphael's studio also express the simplicity and geometric harmony of Renaissance art.

The Romanticism of the *Raphael and La Fornarina* series lies in how Ingres depicts the Renaissance master. He depicts an intimate personal anecdote—Raphael's love affair with the Fornarina—using rich colors and elaborate costumes. According to art historian Kaitlyn Greenberg, "The intimacy between the artist and the woman he supposedly loved until his dying day fit nicely with nineteenth century notions of romanticism."[103] Romanticism often includes a strong emphasis on individual expression and emotion, and these themes are well-suited to a passionate love affair between an artist and his mistress. According to art historian Beth Harris, Ingres' idealized representation of Raphael reflects the "emerging self-consciousness" of artists in the Romantic period.[104] Ingres' inclusion of the *Transfiguration* in the later versions of *Raphael and La Fornarina* **(Figures 34 and 35)** is arguably Romantic as well because the *Transfiguration* evokes the intimacy of Raphael's deathbed scene. According to Vasari's *Lives*, the *Transfiguration* **(Figure 33)** was present at Raphael's deathbed and was used by his friends to commemorate the artist's life. Vasari writes, "That work, in memory of the loss of Raffaello, was placed by the Cardinal [Bernardo Divizio of Bibbiena] on the high-altar of S. Pietro a

[102] Rosenblum p.99
[103] Greenberg, p.17
[104] "Ingres, Raphael and the Fornarina". *Smarthistory*. Created by Beth Harris and Steven Zucker. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CXsstWSXh68

Montorio; and on account of the nobility of his every action, it was held ever afterwards in great estimation."[105] Such a scene likely appealed to Romantics, including Ingres, because of its inherent passion, drama, and art historical significance.

The style of Ingres' *Raphael and La Fornarina* paintings reflects Ingres' broader synthesis of polar opposites within 19th-century French culture: Romanticism and Classicism, love and duty, eroticism and religion, idealism and empiricism. Ingres used the historical genre style, which was associated with sentimentality and nationalist fervor, in order to present an idealized vision of Raphael and the Renaissance. Betzer argues that Ingres' style in the *Raphael and La Fornarina* series reconciled the idealist (advocated by Quatremère de Quincy) and empiricist (advocated by the French archeologist Toussaint-Bernard Émeric-David) standards of beauty. The series reflects the artist's empiricism, because its naturalistic style resembles real life. Ingres depicted the anecdote believably through his keen observation and meticulous rendering of human forms interacting in a physical environment. The paintings simultaneously reflect Ingres' idealism, because his numerous renditions of the theme represent the artist's lifelong pursuit of artistic perfection. He intended each version to surpass the previous ones in beauty and skill.[106]

Versions of Ingres' *Raphael and La Fornarina*

[105] Vasari p.248
[106] Betzer p.22-23

Ingres made five painted versions of *Raphael and La Fornarina*.[107] They include different background details such as various paintings by Raphael, a bearded man, Raphael's Bible, and the architecture of Raphael's studio.[108] In July 1813, Ingres planned for the 1814 Salon, which was his first public display since 1806. He said, "I want to create a stir…at the Salon…to prove to '*Messieurs les genristes'* that supremacy in all the genres belongs to history painters alone."[109] In 1813, Ingres completed the first version of *Raphael and La Fornarina*: the **Riga version (Figure 25)**.[110] Known today only through photographs, it was lost in 1944[111] after the Nazi invasion of Latvia in 1941.[112] According to George Vigne, the recent rediscovery of Ingres' lost portrait of Monsieur Bertin's daughter in the Mahmoud Khalil Museum in Cairo makes modern historians hopeful that Ingres' other lost works, such as the Riga version, may also be found.[113] In the Riga version, the Fornarina is sitting on Raphael's knee. Her open right hand is placed on Raphael's shoulder. The Fornarina glances out toward the viewer. Raphael's body is facing the

---

[107] The Fogg Museum website says there are 6 versions. Wildenstein, Cohn & Siegfried, and van Liere all suggest that there are only 5 versions. Wildenstein's *catalogue raisonné* lists the following 5 versions: the lost 1813 Riga version (Cat. No. 86), the 1814 Fogg version in Cambridge, Massachusetts (Cat. No. 88), an American private collection version in New York (Cat. No. 89), the 1840 version in Columbus, Ohio (Cat. No. 231), and a private collection version in Paris, France (Cat. No. 297). McVaugh lists the following five versions: 1814, 1825, 1830s, 1840, c.1860 (p.380). McVaugh's list roughly corresponds to that of Wildenstein. McVaugh dates the Riga version one year later than Wildenstein to 1814, the year of the Salon. McVaugh dates the Fogg version to 1825, over a decade after the Riga version. McVaugh's third painting is probably the private collection version in New York. This version, also called the Kettaneh version or the American version, is usually dated to the 1830s. Both Wildenstein and McVaugh date the Columbus version to 1840, although Shelton clarified in a personal correspondence that it was made in 1846. The date of the unfinished final version, begun c.1860, is agreed upon by Wildenstein and McVaugh. Betzer states that between 1816-1830, Ingres made 5 paintings, one signed drawing, and supervised the production of 4 prints on the theme of *Raphael and La Fornarina* (p.1). Based on this information, I contend that there are 5 painted versions of Ingres' *Raphael and La Fornarina*: the Riga version (1813), the Fogg version from the Salon of 1814, the Kettaneh version (1830s), the Columbus version (1846), and the unfinished Chrysler version (c.1860).

[108] All versions of Ingres' *Raphael and La Fornarina* include Raphael, the Fornarina, and a canvas of Raphael's *La Fornarina* portrait. The *Madonna della sedia* is pictured in the Fogg version (1814) and the Kettaneh version (1830s). The *Transfiguration* is depicted in the Columbus version (1846) and the Chrysler version (c.1860). The bearded man appears in the Kettaneh version (1830s) and the Columbus version (1846). An open window revealing the Vatican in the distance appears in the Fogg version (1814) and the Chrysler version (c.1860).

[109] Ingres, as quoted in Cohn & Siegfried p.54

[110] Cohn & Siegfried p.56; van Liere p.108

[111] Siegfried p.186, van Liere p.108

[112] Wildenstein p.177, Vigne p.122

[113] Vigne, p.160

Fornarina as the artist embraces her. His head is turned toward his canvas, however, which is angled out toward the viewer. The Riga version thus openly invites audience participation. The glances of the Fornarina and Raphael create a triangle that connects the Fornarina, the canvas, and the viewer. The Fornarina's outer garment sags seductively, revealing her shoulder and upper chest.

The second version, now in the **Fogg (Figure 26)**, was made in 1814.[114] The picture was bought by Count de Pourtalès-Gorgier, a Swiss banker and connoisseur who also purchased Ingres' *Grande Odalisque* **(Figure 28)** from the 1819 Salon.[115] In this version, Ingres based his depiction of Raphael on the *Portrait of Bindo Altoviti* **(Figure 12)**.[116] Ingres imagined Raphael's studio to be in Old St. Peter's during a midday siesta.[117] He modeled the Fornarina's chair on the one in Raphael's *Portrait of Pope Leo X with Cardinals Giulio de Medici and Luigi de Rossi* **(Figure 27)**.[118] The Fornarina's ornate burgundy chair is perpendicular to Raphael's simple brown wooden stool. Raphael's hands are clasped together in his embrace of his mistress. The Fornarina is sitting on Raphael's lap; her right hand rests gently on Raphael's shoulder. Ingres has meticulously depicted the ruffles of the couple's clothes. The Fornarina wears an exotic golden headdress with green stripes; she holds the tip of the headdress in her left hand. The Fornarina wears golden rings and bracelets. Although the Fornarina's dress is low cut, she is mostly clothed. Raphael wears a black cape over a striped golden shirt and a black hat. The cape has a decorated red interior. Underneath the golden shirt, Raphael is wearing a puffy white blouse. He dons bright red, sock-like shoes. In the foreground, the brightly colored floor is ornately decorated with geometric motifs. Its dominant colors are red and green, matching

[114] Cohn & Siegfried p.54 (Alazard, 1950, p.54; Whiteley, 1977, no.33)
[115] Cohn & Siegfried p.54; *Grande Odalisque* (Louvre, W.93)
[116] Van Liere p.108
[117] Cohn & Siegfried p.56
[118] Van Liere, p.108

Raphael's red shoes and the Fornarina's dark olive green tunic. Directly behind Raphael, there is an easel holding a canvas on which a drawing of the Fornarina has been sketched. In the background, there is a long wooden desk decorated with vegetal motifs. Raphael's Bible is sitting on it at the left, and the *Madonna of the Chair* is sitting on it at the right. According to van Liere, Ingres' inclusion of Raphael's Bible shows "the divinity of Raphael."[119] In the top left corner, the curtain of the window is pulled back to reveal a view of Roman architecture, including two black Doric columns. Ingres' brushwork is smooth and highly refined. The linear perspective is believable, and the chiaroscuro is impeccably executed. There is a clear three-dimensionality to Raphael and the Fornarina.

The Fogg version of *Raphael and La Fornarina* was panned by some critics of the first Bourbon Salon in 1814, but its lack of overt political messaging appealed to politically liberal but artistically conservative critics like François-Séraphin Delpech and Edme Miel.[120] Although they did not esteem genre paintings, these critics praised Ingres' choice of subject matter. Delpech wrote that the painting's "faults are amply redeemed by the inexpressible grace of the ensemble…which I have not encountered in any other [genre] paintings."[121] Miel wrote, "In an interval of repose and without laying aside his crayon, [Raphael] has … seized [his mistress] in his arms and set her on his knees. His eyes are turned toward the sketched image. He seems to compare the copy to the model; he interrogates these first lines and seeks to assure himself that he had succeeded in fixing on canvas the features he idolizes…."[122] Later in 1820, Miel wrote approvingly of Ingres' Raphaelesque style. Although he despised the so-called 'gothic'

[119] Van Liere p.108
[120] Cohn & Siegfried p.56
[121] Delpech (1814, p.210-211), as quoted in Cohn & Siegfried p.56
[122] Miel (1814-1815, 5 Feb), as quoted in Cohn & Siegfried p.56

characteristics of Ingres' earlier style, he recalled the gothic origins of Renaissance art and considered Ingres to be the new Raphael.[123]

In a fully rendered drawing of *Raphael and La Fornarina* from 1825 **(Figure 29)**, Ingres included a figure that appears to be Michelangelo, based on its resemblance to Daniele da Volterra's portrait of that artist **(Figure 30)**. Beginning with the **Kettaneh version** (1830s)[124] **(Figure 31)**, Ingres included what van Liere calls a "lurking loneliness and monk-like character"—an envious Michelangelo—in his *Raphael and La Fornarina* paintings.[125] According to van Liere, in this version Ingres depicts the Fornarina as "more of a temptress" and "clingingly possessive in her embrace of Raphael" while Raphael "ignores her presence altogether."[126] The color palette is noticeably more subdued compared to the Fogg version **(Figure 26)**. The brushwork is extremely smooth. Raphael wears a black tunic over a puffy white undershirt. Ingres meticulously represented the ruffles of the outer tunics, although they are quite flat on the white undershirt. The Fornarina wears a golden dress with a white interior. As in the Fogg version **(Figure 26)**, the Fornarina's headdress is golden but it has orange, not green stripes. Ingres has eliminated the ostentatious accessories that the Fornarina wears in the Fogg version **(Figure 26)**. The couple are silhouetted against a solid dark green background. Michelangelo is on the left. He wears a dark brown tunic (matching the color of his hair) and holds a large scroll. The inclusion of Michelangelo may allude to a scene from Quatremère's

---

[123] Miel (1820, 13 Mar), as cited in Cohn & Siegfried p.56

[124] The American collection version and the Kettaneh version are one and the same. It was made in the 1830s and included a third figure, identified as Michelangelo. According to Betzer, this version was made c.1814 and is part of a private collection (Betzer p.27). Vigne also speaks of an American collection version from 1814, presumably the same one (p.122). Betzer and van Liere disagree on the date; van Liere dates this same painting, in the Kettaneh Collection, New York, to the 1830s (van Liere p.114). Based on the Fornarina's pose and the inclusion of a bearded man, this American private collection version is more stylistically similar to the 1846 Columbus version. This version is noticeably different from the Riga and Foga versions, which are similar to each other and are both dated earlier in Ingres' career (1813-14). Therefore, van Liere's later date (1830s) is probably the correct one.

[125] Vigne p.123; van Liere p.113. Both Vigne and van Liere identify the third figure as Michelangelo.

[126] Van Liere p.113

biography in which Raphael and Michelangelo exchanged insults about each others' reputation. This episode was also depicted in Horace Vernet's contemporaneous painting of *Raphael at the Vatican* **(Figure 32)** from the Salon of 1833.[127] From the easel at right, a drawing of the Fornarina stares out at the viewer. Raphael rests his left hand on the easel, behind which Raphael's *Madonna of the Chair* is partially visible. According to van Liere, the position of the heads of Raphael and the Fornarina mirrors that of the figures in the *Madonna of the Chair* **(Figure 6)**.[128]

In the last two versions, the eroticism of the Fornarina's body is counterbalanced by the solemn religious presence of Raphael's *Transfiguration* **(Figure 33)**, a painting now located in the Pinacoteca, Vatican City.[129] The **Columbus version** (1846)[130] **(Figure 34)** is signed "Ingres à son ami Duban, 1846."[131] Jacques Félix Duban was a French architect and friend of Ingres. Ingres' brushwork in the Columbus version is unusually loose. The figures inside the *Transfiguration* are delineated by wisps of color rather than fine contours. The chiaroscuro and linear perspective of the furniture are highly naturalistic, but the figures are surprisingly flat. The Columbus version depicts Raphael sitting on a wooden stool. The Fornarina rests her cheek on Raphael's head, which represents a further refinement of the pose from the previous version.[132] Raphael's body is facing the Fornarina, while his head is turned toward the easel. The canvas appears to display a preliminary sketch of Raphael's *Fornarina* portrait. Raphael's gesture is relaxed; he rests his arm against his easel. Raphael's right leg is propped up on a wooden stool.

---

[127] Haskell p.65
[128] Van Liere p.113
[129] Cohn & Siegfried p.56
[130] According to Vigne, the Columbus version was made in 1846 (*Ingres*, p.125, fig. 94). Wildenstein dates it to 1840 during Ingres' stay in Rome as head of the French Academy there (p.211). In a personal communication, Shelton stated that in the painting's signature, "Ingres à son ami Duban, 1840," the last digit is ambiguously rendered as either a 0 or a 6. Shelton dated it to 1846.
[131] Wildenstein p.211
[132] Van Liere p.113

He has a Jesus-like face; he has long chestnut hair and a beard. He wears a dark brown cape over a red shirt and pants. He wears a bright white collar that spans the width of his chest. The Renaissance master dons light brown shoes. There is a chair directly in front of Raphael, suggesting that the Fornarina had gotten up from her modeling to hug the artist. Raphael holds a paintbrush in his right hand as he embraces the Fornarina. Behind Raphael and the Fornarina, Michelangelo is seen in a black tunic holding a staff in his raised right hand. His facial features are signified by impressionistic paint blots.

Behind the cuddling couple, Raphael's *Transfiguration* is prominently visible, although it is cut off at the top at Jesus' feet. Raphael and the Fornarina are placed in the center of the crowd below Mount Tabor. Two members of the crowd bracket the couple and point up at Jesus. The crowd thereby directs the viewer's attention from Raphael's mistress and his art toward the ultimate purpose of the artist's profession: to serve his religion. This feature of the painting reflects how, in Raphael's life, art (represented by Raphael's canvas) and sexuality (represented by his mistress) were 'transfigured' for higher spiritual purposes. Vasari states that, like the event it depicts, Raphael's *Transfiguration*—and its naturalistic style more generally, one could argue—reveal the perfect beauty of God.[133] The presence of the *Transfiguration* epitomizes Ingres' self-perception as an artist defending a national, even divine, heritage derived from Raphael and the Renaissance.

The **Chrysler version** (c.1860)[134] **(Figure 35)** was Ingres' final, unfinished painting of *Raphael and La Fornarina*. In 1860, Ingres said this last version "will cause the former ones to be forgotten."[135] According to van Liere, the Fornarina is here "at her fleshiest," reflecting the

[133] Vasari p.241
[134] The final version (c.1860) is now in a private collection (Betzer p.19).
[135] Ingres (transl. Wildenstein, p.226), as quoted in Cohn & Siegfried p.56

sensuality of the *Turkish Bath* **(Figure 36)**, which Ingres was working on at the same time.[136] This tantalizing depiction reflects how Ingres, who was himself approaching death, contemplated the relationship between Raphael's eroticism and his premature death. The absence of Michelangelo may signify how Delacroix (represented by Michelangelo[137]) died before his rival Ingres (represented by Raphael). The Fornarina's breasts are clearly visible, even more so than in the Riga version **(Figure 25)**. Ingres died before he could finish painting the Fornarina's dress and Raphael's pants, both of which are currently greenish grey. The Fornarina's sumptuous backside rests on Raphael's propped-up right knee. As in the Riga version **(Figure 25)**, the Fornarina glances out at the viewer. She rests her head on Raphael's head while grasping his shoulders. As in the Fogg version **(Figure 26)**, the Fornarina's burgundy chair is perpendicular to Raphael's stool. As usual, Ingres has rendered the furniture with immaculate shading and fine contours. Raphael rests his left elbow against the easel, from which the Fornarina stares directly out at the viewer. She is holding her bare breasts, which mirrors the pose in the original Barberini portrait **(Figure 1)**. Raphael wears a black tunic and looks back at the Fornarina drawing. His body is more frontal than in previous versions, which makes his glance more realistic and comfortable. Directly behind the couple, the demoniac child in Raphael's *Transfiguration* is barely visible. Above the *Fornarina* canvas, a tiny window reveals a Roman building. This detail is similar to the window in the Fogg version **(Figure 26)**.

Existing Research on Ingres' *Raphael and La Fornarina*

[136] Van Liere p.114

[137] According to van Liere, Delacroix identified himself with Michelangelo. Van Liere argues that there was a parallel between the rivalry of Ingres and Delacroix and that of Raphael and Michelangelo in the Renaissance (van Liere p.112).

Existing research on Ingres' *Raphael and La Fornarina* series has tended to emphasize two themes. First, Ingres' series is seen as a commentary on the practice of art itself, inviting the viewer to vicariously participate in the translation of ideas from the mind of the artist to his canvas. Second, the series is seen as reflecting (and in some instances as disrupting) the gender and identity norms regarding artistic creation in 19th-century France. Scholars generally agree that the Fornarina in Ingres' paintings represents a feminine archetype such as Mother Nature, the Virgin Mary, or a muse.[138]

In his pioneering article from 1981 entitled "Ingres' *Raphael and the Fornarina*: Reverence and Testimony," Eldon van Liere outlines how the different versions of Ingres' *Raphael and La Fornarina* evolved over time.[139] He explains how Raphael's art was a lifelong influence on Ingres and discusses the *Raphael and La Fornarina* series in relation to Ingres' other Raphaelesque paintings such as *The Vow of Louis XIII* **(Figure 23)**, *The Apotheosis of Homer* **(Figure 37)**, and *Jesus Among the Doctors* **(Figure 38)**.[140] Van Liere compares the Fornarina and the *Transfiguration* in Ingres' series, writing that they together represent the relationship between sensuality and death.[141] He also draws a parallel between the Fornarina and the *Madonna of the Chair* in Ingres' series. Just as the Fornarina is the conduit of creativity, van Liere argues, the Madonna is the conduit of salvation.[142]

In her 1986 article "Ingres Other-Wise," Wendy Leeks interprets the *Raphael and La Fornarina* series through a psychoanalytic perspective on gender. She argues that Ingres' depiction of the Fornarina combines "the virgin and the odalisque."[143] To support this claim, she compares the Fornarina's headdress to those worn by the odalisques in Ingres' *Turkish Bath*

[138] Van Liere, p.114
[139] Van Liere, p.108-113
[140] Van Liere, p.108
[141] Van Liere, p.113
[142] Van Liere, p.114
[143] Betzer, p.33

(Figure 36).[144] Leeks further explains that the Fornarina's headdress was inspired by those in Raphael's *La Fornarina* portrait **(Figure 1)** and in the *Madonna of the Chair* **(Figure 6)**.[145] To Leeks, the theme of *Raphael and La Fornarina* represents the "sexual desire of male for female and [the] reverential love of son for mother."[146] She argues that Raphael represents the traditional male roles of husband and son, while the Fornarina represents the traditional female roles of wife and mother. She explains the connection between the seemingly unrelated roles through the lens of the Freudian Oedipus complex. She writes, "According to Lacanian psychoanalytic theory, conscious sexual desire is premised upon another desire which has been repressed into the unconscious."[147] In Leeks' interpretation, Ingres' *Raphael and La Fornarina* series represents the sublimation of unconscious Oedipal desire into a traditional heterosexual relationship.

In her 2015 article "Art as Lover: Rereading Ingres' *Raphael and the Fornarina*," Sarah Betzer argues that Ingres' *Raphael and La Fornarina* paintings reveal "the entangled nature of art and desire."[148] According to Betzer, most scholars before her understood *Raphael and La Fornarina* to signify "the male artist's difference and distance from the female subject."[149] Betzer credits Leeks for challenging the interpretation of *Raphael and La Fornarina* as a reflection of traditional gender norms. Nonetheless, Betzer still criticizes Leeks' analysis for reinforcing the gendered polarity of male and female in *Raphael and La Fornarina*.[150] Departing from previous interpretations of the series, Betzer asserts that Ingres' depiction of the couple "poses a challenge to gendered dichotomies."[151] She argues that *Raphael and La Fornarina* deviates from Ingres' other depictions of the female nude in such works as the *Half-Length Bather* **(Figure 39)**, the

[144] Leeks, p.32
[145] Leeks, p.32
[146] Leeks p.33
[147] Leeks, p.33
[148] Betzer p.1
[149] Betzer p.5
[150] Betzer p.6
[151] Betzer p.7

Grand Odalisque (1814) **(Figure 28)**, and the *Turkish Bath* (1863) **(Figure 36)**.[152] She contends that Ingres' *Raphael and La Fornarina* is "an invitation to identification" that involves "formal cross-gendering."[153] To substantiate her claim, Betzer cites a preparatory sketch **(Figure 40)** for *Raphael and La Fornarina* in which Ingres depicted Raphael as a female, or at least used a female model for the figure of the artist.[154] In another preparatory sketch **(Figure 41)**, Betzer observes, Ingres depicts a miniature version of *Raphael and La Fornarina* inside an odalisque's back. She claims that this *Half-Length Bather* sketch disrupts the traditional 19th-century gender binary between the active male artist and the passive female subject.[155] In Betzer's view, Ingres' *Study of Raphael, the Easel, and the Head of the Fornarina* **(Figure 42)** show how the *Raphael and La Fornarina* series invites the male artist to identify with the female subject.[156]

Van Liere's article was foundational to the scholarship on Ingres' *Raphael and La Fornarina* series. It eloquently articulates Ingres' role as the defender of Raphael against certain members of the Romantic movement. Van Liere's brief discussion of gender in Ingres' series was further elaborated by subsequent scholars. The gendered perspective of Leeks and Betzer offer creative insights into what makes Ingres' series so compelling. Leeks provides the more convincing analysis of Ingres' depiction of gender in the *Raphael and La Fornarina* paintings. Betzer insists that the series is non-traditional in its treatment of gender, but this argument imposes 21st-century notions of gender fluidity onto a 19th-century painting. It is more likely that Ingres' series expresses the complementarity—rather than the ambiguity—of traditional male and female roles in the creation of art. Although their roles are different, the male artist (Raphael) and the female model (the Fornarina) are both indispensable to the process; their

[152] Betzer p.6
[153] Betzer p.7
[154] Betzer p.26
[155] Betzer p.6
[156] Betzer p.22

mutual affection is the lifeblood of artistic creativity. To varying degrees of success, these three scholars capture the psychological power of Ingres' *Raphael and La Fornarina* paintings, which transcended the platitudes of Neoclassical art. Ingres' *Raphael and La Fornarina* series depicts a Classicist theme (the life of Raphael) through a deeply personal vignette of erotic love. In this way, Ingres' series was able to accomplish the perfect synthesis of Classicism and Romanticism, which was as timeless as it was idiosyncratic.

Bibliography

Betzer, Sarah. "Art as Lover: Rereading Ingres' Raphael and the Fornarina". *Oxford Art Journal*. Published 23 Oct 2015.

Brown, David Alan and Jan Van Nimmen, *Raphael and the Beautiful Baker: A Story of the Bindo Altoviti Portrait*. New Haven and London, 2005, p.85-107.

Brown, Marilyn R. "Ingres's Pursuit of Perfection." Art Journal, vol. 44, no. 2, 1984, pp. 179–183., www.jstor.org/stable/776760. Accessed 12 Sept. 2020.

Cohn, Majorie B. and Susan L. Siegfried. *Works by J.A.D. Ingres in the Collection of the Fogg Art Museum*. Accessed 14 Sept 2020.

Duppa, Richard. The Life of Raffaello Sanzio Da Urbino (1816). J. Murray. https://books.google.com/books?id=J3pHAAAAYAAJ&pg=PA2&source=gbs_toc_r&cad=4#v=onepage&q&f=false

Epstein, Danya. "Pathology and Imagination: Ingres' Anatomical Distortions". Arizona State University (May 2015). https://repository.asu.edu/attachments/150457/content/Epstein_asu_0010N_14669.pdf.

Greenberg, Kaitlyn. “Immortal Beloved? Raphael’s *La Fornarina* and *La Velata* as Allegory, History, and Legend”. Secular Art in the Italian Renaissance. Professor Sarah Blake McHam. 4 May 2018. *Academia.edu*. https://www.academia.edu/37500683/Immortal_Beloved_Raphaels_La_Fornarina_and_La_Velata_as_Allegory_History_and_Legend

Harris, Dr. Beth and Dr. Steven Zucker. “Ingres, Raphael, and the Fornarina.” *Smarthistory.* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CXsstWSXh68.

Haskell, Francis. “The Old Masters in 19th-Century French Painting.” Art Quarterly, 24, Spring 1971, p.55-85. Accessed 30 Sept 2020.

Ingres, “Study for Raphael and the Fornarina” (c.1814?). Metropolitan Museum of Art. https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/459965.

Krauss, Rosalind. “You, Irreplaceable You.” *Studies in the History of Art* Vol. 20, Symposium Papers VII: Retaining the Original: Multiple Originals, Copies, and Reproductions (1989), pp. 151-159. Published by National Gallery of Art. https://www-jstor-org.proxy.lib.ohio-state.edu/stable/42620163

“La Fornarina”, Galleria Borghese, https://web.archive.org/web/20120519051213/http://www.galleriaborghese.it/barberini/it/fornarin.htm.

Lathers, Marie. *Bodies of Art: French Literary Realism and the Artist's Model. University of Nebraska Press* (2001). pp. 60ff. ISBN 978-0-8032-2941-9 https://books.google.com/books?id=vB3pJgkLEXUC&pg=PA60#v=onepage&q&f=false.

Leeks, Wendy. “Ingres Other-Wise.” Oxford Art Journal, vol. 9, no. 1, 1986, pp. 29–37. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/1360370. Accessed 29 Sept. 2020.

Liere, Eldon van. ‘Ingres’ Raphael and the Fornarina: Reverence and Testimony’, Arts magazine, vol 56, Dec 1981, p.108-15.

McVaugh, Robert E. “Turner and Rome, Raphael and the Fornarina.” Studies in Romanticism, vol. 26, no. 3, 1987, pp. 365–398. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/25600666. Accessed 12 Sept. 2020.

Quincy, Quatremère de. Life of Raphael. The North American Review, vol. 46, no. 98, 1838, pp. 83–106. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/25103986. Accessed 29 Sept. 2020.

Rifkin, Adrian. *Ingres, Then and Now*. Routledge, 2000. P.1-20

“Rome and Florence (1806-1824): Paintings in the New ‘Troubadour’ Style.” The Louvre. http://mini-site.louvre.fr/ingres/1.4.2.4_en.html.

Rosenberg, Martin. *Raphael and France*. Penn State University Press; 1st Edition (December 31, 1994).

Rosenberg, Martin. “Raphael’s *Transfiguration* and Napoleon’s Cultural Politics”. *Eighteenth-Century Studies*. Vol. 19, No. 2 (Winter, 1985-1986), pp. 180-205. Published by John Hopkins University Press. Sponsored by American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies (ASECS). https://www-jstor-org.proxy.lib.ohio-state.edu/stable/2738641

Rosenblum, Robert. *Masters of Art: Jean-Auguste-Dominique Ingres*. New York: H.N. Abrams, 1990.

Shelton, Andrew Carrington. *Ingres*. London; New York: Phaidon, 2008.

Shelton, Andrew Carrington. “Ingres versus Delacroix”. *Art History*, Vol 23, No 5, Dec 2000, p.

726-742. https://www.academia.edu/28541045/Ingres_versus_Delacroix?auto=download

Shelton, Andrew Carrington. Review of Todd Porterfield and Susan L. Siegfried's *Staging Empire: Napoleon, Ingres and David*. From Nineteenth-Century French Studies. Vol. 37, No. 1/2 (Fall-Winter 2008-2009), pp. 146-148. Published by University of Nebraska Press. https://www-jstor-org.proxy.lib.ohio-state.edu/stable/23538271

Vasari, Giorgio. *Lives of the Most Excellent Painters, Sculptors, and Architects* (1568). Giunti. Translation by *Project Gutenberg*. http://www.gutenberg.org/files/28420/28420-h/28420-h.htm#Page_207

Vigne, George. *Ingres*. New York: Abbeville Press, 1995.

Wildenstein, George. *Catalogue raisonné of Ingres* (1956). Phaidon.

Wolohojian, Stephan and Anna Tahinci. *A Private Passion: 19th-Century Paintings and Drawings from the Grenville L. Winthrop Collection, Harvard University.* Published by the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. Distributed by Yale University Press.

Wolzogen, Alfred Baron von. *Raphael Santi: His Life and His Works* (1866). Translated by F.E. Bunnet. https://brittlebooks.library.illinois.edu/brittlebooks_open/Books2009-06/wolzal0001rapsan/wolzal0001rapsan.pdf